



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

work, a detailed summary of its contents, a brief estimate of the literary worth of the poem, an exhaustive account of Lucretius' handling of the hexameter as illustrated by Book IV (pages 7-17), and in closing, a conspectus of the history of the text. Of these, the metrical matter has independent value and will need to be considered by investigators of Lucretius' verse technique.

The carefully printed Latin text is based on Bailey's, with conservative variants. The full critical notes are cumbered with much needless information about unimportant readings. In the version, clearness, simplicity, and directness, essential qualities in a rendering of Lucretius to which the French lends itself admirably, are characteristic throughout, and naturally attain to grace and rhythmical movement in the less technical passages. Marginal topics, conveniently adjusted to the text, give assistance especially welcome in this part of the work.

In his commentary, M. Ernout addresses himself, on the whole, decidedly to the scholar rather than to the general reader. There is much purely philological matter; the "parallel passage" at times becomes deadly; and one leaves the notes inclined to regret that the author had not spared us some of his morphological erudition and given instead,—what so few editions of Lucretius or of any other Latin writer do give,—larger measure of intelligent and incisive criticism, from a sympathetic, common-sense, modern point of view, of the subject-matter of the book. Perhaps this is asking something beyond the professed scope of the edition (cf. Introduction, p. 4); but then why interpolate a linguistic commentary with philosophical and scientific flotsam?

Carefully prepared indices of phrases discussed and passages cited from Lucretius make easy of access the information contained in the notes.

The proof-reading and typework in general are excellent throughout. A mistaken heading appears in the Introduction, p. 11: "c" should be uniform with "i" of p. 9?. Exceptional are slips like those on p. 18 (read "important" and "Cyril").

H. W. LITCHFIELD.

AMHERST COLLEGE.

A Concordance to the Works of Horace, compiled and edited by
LANE COOPER, published by The Carnegie Institution of
Washington, Washington, 1916.

The compiler and editor of this concordance, Dr. LANE COOPER, Professor of the English Language and Literature in

Cornell University, needs no introduction to American classicists. On more than one occasion he has shown, by word and deed, that he is thoroughly imbued with a sense of the importance of the ancient classics, and, again, in the preface to this work, he states that one of his principal reasons for undertaking the labor was the "hope that a concordance of a Latin poet, emanating from a teacher of English, might tend to strengthen the bonds of sympathy between devotees of the ancient classics and students of modern literature; for", continues he, "unless such bonds are constantly renewed, the study of modern literature, at least, is prone to become one-sided or unduly sentimental, or to go entirely astray." The method employed in the compilation of this work was substantially the same as that which was followed in the preparation of the author's Concordance of Wordsworth. "It has been his desire", the author says, "to perfect and, as in the present case, to exemplify a method by which works of this description may be produced quickly and with a great saving of energy, through organization of effort, the collaboration of many hands, and the use of mechanical devices for the attainment of speed and accuracy in recording." The details of the method for Horace have been set forth in printed instructions, copies of which may be had from the editor at Ithaca, New York. The preparation of the original slips on which the present Concordance is based was intrusted to a corps of eighteen collaborators. The editing of these slips with a view to improving the context wherever necessary, and the production of the slips that contained the variant readings, was the work of Professor COOPER. A number of the eighteen collaborators, with other friends and students of the editor, gave aid in the first stages of the alphabetical ordering of slips, and Miss Mary A. Ewer directed special efforts to making the record exact and complete.

The Concordance to the Works of Horace is a work of considerable size. On 593 small-quarto pages, it contains, in addition to the catchwords in bold-faced type, about 45,000 references and nearly the same number of quotations. The methods employed in the production of the Concordance are so well calculated to eliminate error, the surface indications of excellence are so striking, and the statements of the author as to the efforts that were made to secure completeness and accuracy are so reassuring, that there was every temptation for the reviewer to limit himself to merely a perfunctory examination of the work. But considerations of justice to author, reader and publisher alike made it imperative to institute some sort of a serious test. The very best test of an index or of a concordance is the actual use of the work for the purposes for which it was intended. To approximate the conditions of such a test, the writer selected portions from various parts

of Horace's works, looked up each word in the Concordance, examined the illustrative quotations wherever given, and verified the references. The passages selected were *Carm.* 1. 11 (entire); 3. 3 (entire); *Serm.* 1. 9 (lines 1-15); 2. 1 (lines 1-15); *Epist.* 1. 1 (lines 1-15); and *Epist.* 2. 2 (lines 1-51). There are more than one thousand words in these selections, and incidentally scores of other citations and references were examined, so that the test involved more than one thousand consultations of the Concordance and covered more than one forty-fifth of the entire volume. The result of the test, it should be said at once, was a striking confirmation of the initial impressions as to the superior merits of the work. Before proceeding to speak of these merits at greater length, it seems best to comment on certain features of the work that one might wish to see modified in concordances that may in the future be patterned after this one.

In the first place, a plea may here be registered for a diminution in the list of words that are cited without context. Surely, if *tibi* and all the other forms of *tu* are cited with their full context, *tu*, which is not so frequent as *tibi*, deserves the same treatment; and, if all the other forms of *ille* are cited with context, *ille* itself should be so cited. For a similar reason, one should desire the context of *se*; of *haec*, *hic*, *hoc*, *hunc*; of *quae*, *quam*, *qui*, *quid*, *quis*, *quo*, *quod*. Why should *est* and *sunt* alone out of all the forms of the copula be represented only by references? And, if some of the prepositions are cited with their context, why not all of them? Even thus a large enough list would remain which many scholars would be glad to see abridged: *ac*, *an*, *at*, *atque*, *aut*, *cum*, *cur*, *dum*, *et*, *iam*, *nam*, *ne*, *-ne*, *nec*, *neque*, *nisi*, *non*, *o*, *-que*, *quo* (*adv.*), *quod* (*conj.*), *sed*, *seu*, *si*, *sic*, *sive*, *tam*, *tamen*, *ut*, *-ve*, *vel*.

There are in the text of Horace many passages which are enclosed in quotation marks. When, in the Concordance, only the beginning or the end of such passages is cited, one of the quotation marks is regularly omitted; e. g., '*nil opus est te / circumagi* (*Serm.* 1. 9. 16); *nil sine magno / vita labore dedit mortalibus*' (*Serm.* 1. 9. 59). This phenomenon is at first a little disconcerting until, after repeated consultations, one discovers that the omission is probably designed and is due to the mechanical process employed in the compilation of the book. It would have been a gain, if, in the Preface, attention had been called to this peculiarity.

A difficult problem in the making of a concordance is that of determining the amount of the context to be cited. The usual tendency is toward insufficiency of context. Professor COOPER has, upon the whole, admirably resisted this tendency, and scholars are greatly indebted to him for the amplitude of his citations. A trifle more generosity, however, in examples

like the following, would have made the work more ideal. In *nonne*, *cupidinibus* *statuat* *natura* *modum* *quem* (under *quem*, *Serm.* 1. 2. 111), both *nonne* and *quem* are suspended in mid-air; *nonne* requires its complement *plus prodest*, and *quem* becomes more intelligible by the addition of *quaerere*. *mente* *quatit* *solida* *neque* *Auster* (under *mente*, *Carm.* 3. 3. 4) would have been improved by the presence of *non* as cited under *quatit*, and still more satisfactory would have been the citation given under *solida*: *non* *voltus* *instantis* *tyranni* / *mente* *quatit* *solida* *neque* *Auster*. *Auster* would have been illuminating at the head of *dux* *inquieta* *turbidus* *Hadriae* (under *dux*, *Carm.* 3. 3. 5). In *catulos* *ferae* / *celent* *inultae* (under *catulos*, *ferae*, *celent* and *inultae*, *Carm.* 3. 3. 41-42), one misses the *dum* to indicate the nature of the subjunctive. *quam* *cogere* *humanos* *in* *usus* (under *cogere*, *humanos* and *usus*, *Carm.* 3. 3. 51) would be much clearer if *spernere* *fortior* preceded. *tecum* *sic* *agat* (under *agat*, *Epist.* 2. 2. 3) is made ambiguous by the suppression of the word *siquis*. *castellum* *evertere* *praetor* / *nescio* *quod* *cupiens* *hortari* *coepit* (under *hortari* and *coepit*, *Epist.* 2. 2. 35) is incomplete without the word *eundem*, which is the object of *hortari* and follows *coepit* in the text of Horace.

A closely related but much easier problem is that of the maintenance of consistency with respect to the amount of a given context that is cited under the various words which compose that context. When once certain words have been chosen as constituting a suitable context, there is an obvious advantage in adhering strictly to this context. The editor seems not to have made this an inviolable rule. For example, under *hac*, *Carm.* 3. 3. 9, he has selected *hac arte* *Pollux* *et* *vagus* *Hercules* / *enisus* *arces* *attigit* *igneas* as a satisfactory context and has adhered to this context under *arte*, *Pollux* and *attigit*; but, greatly to the detriment of the sense, he has eliminated the words *hac arte* *Pollux* *et* under *vagus*, *Hercules*, *enisus*, *arces* and *igneas*. Again, under *recumbens*, *Carm.* 3. 3. 11, the author has admitted *quos* *inter* *Augustus* *recumbens* / *purpureo* *bibet* *ore* *nectar*,—an eminently satisfactory context: but under *quos* and *Augustus* only *quos* *inter* *Augustus* *recumbens* is cited; under *purpureo*, *ore* and *nectar*, *purpureo* *bibet* *ore* *nectar* is given; and under *bibet*, the unsatisfactory *Augustus* *recumbens* / *purpureo* *bibet* *ore* *nectar* appears. Under *Priami*, *Carm.* 3. 3. 26, *nec* *Priami* *domus* / *periura* *pugnacis* *Achivos* / *Hectoreis* *opibus* *refringit* is chosen as the citation, and the same citation reappears under *domus*, *periura*, *Achivos* and *refringit*; but under *pugnacis* the *nec* is omitted, and under *Hectoreis* and *opibus* the passage is abridged to *pugnacis* *Achivos* / *Hectoreis* *opibus* *refringit*.

In the matter of variants, the editor's laudable desire has been to secure the utmost possible completeness, but it is hard

to see what good has been accomplished by the inclusion of variants that could not possibly have stood in the Horatian text. So under *nihil* one meets the following: "nil [?nihil] sine magno / vita labore [?labore vita] dedit mortalibus." ? *var. Serm.* 1. 9. 59". The same, with but a change in the numbering of the verse, recurs under *labore* and *vita*. But *nihil* and *labore vita* are both unmetrical. A more glaring example is found in connection with *Epist.* 2. 2. 18. In addition to the regular text, *prudens emisti vitiosum, dicta tibi est lex*, this same text with the unmetrical variants *dicta est tibi lex* and *dicta tibi lex est* respectively is twice cited under *dicta, tibi* and *lex* each, and six lines have thus been wasted.

"The separation of words spelled alike but of different meanings, and of the same grammatical forms with slightly different functions," is regarded by the author as a work of supererogation, though, as a matter of fact, he has for the most part endeavored to carry out such a separation. In the case of words like *ut, quid* and *quod*, of which only the references are given, the user of the book, in order to determine the method of classification, is compelled to look up a number of the references under each rubric. This may be a task of considerable magnitude, and in some instances one cannot be sure of the precise nature of the examples that are grouped under a particular rubric until one has examined all of the examples in their proper context. In the case of words that are cited with their context, the nature of the categories may, as a rule, readily be seen from the citations themselves. An occasional oversight in classification has been noted. To say nothing of *gratum* in *o diva, gratum quae regis Antium*, *Carm.* 1. 35. 1, which is plainly an adjective and describes Antium, but which seems to have gotten into the wrong company in the Concordance, *omne* in *quando et priores hinc Lamias ferunt / denominatos et nepotum / per memores genus omne fastos*, *Carm.* 3. 17. 4, is listed as a nominative, though the word *genus* of this passage is correctly classified as an accusative. *Super* in *quereris super hoc etiam*, *Epist.* 2. 2. 24, is placed under the ablative examples of *super*, whereas the *hoc* of this passage is placed under the accusatives. In *unde laboris / plus haurire mali est quam ex re decerpere fructus*, *Serm.* 1. 2. 78-79, *plus* is the accusative and does not belong to a category different from the one that follows it in the Concordance.

It would be very unjust to the editor not to state that the infelicities that have been noted here and there in the Concordance vanish when viewed in their proper perspective, and it must be conceded that as to some, at least, of the suggestions that are contained in the preceding paragraphs, there may be a difference of opinion. In any case, the fact remains that the Concordance to the Works of Horace is a work of rare com-

pleteness and accuracy. Of the more than thousand words that formed the basis of the present test, every one was found duly recorded. In the vastly more than thousand references that were verified, not an error was discovered. In the approximately one thousand illustrative quotations that were examined, there was noticed but a single misprint; the "r" of *iurgares* was omitted in the citation, under *te*, of Epist. 2. 2. 22, *ne mea saevos / iurgares ad te quod epistula nulla rediret*. To the amplitude of the individual quotations, witness has been borne above. The typography of the book is excellent, and the quality and the color of the paper leave nothing to be desired. In short, the editor, his assistants and the Carnegie Institution of Washington are to be congratulated on the success of their undertaking, and they may rest assured that by "the doing of this work" they have earned "the gratitude of scholars for generations to come."

C. W. E. MILLER.

Studies in the Diction of the *Sermo Amatorius* in Roman Comedy. By KEITH PRESTON. University of Chicago Dissertation, 1916. Pp. 67.

This is an interesting and well considered study of the vocabulary of Roman lovers as it appears in Plautus and Terence. Pichon had already done much for this subject in his well known *De Sermone Amatorio apud Latinos Elegiarum Scriptores*. Dr. Preston has gone further into the detailed discussion of usage and has rendered his work particularly valuable by full citation and analysis of the same sphere in Greek. I am inclined to think that he could have rendered his discussion still more valuable if he had given the same close attention also to the amatory vocabulary of the elegy. For instance, on p. 42, his discussion of *cadere* in the erotic sense, 'tumbling', as Ophelia says, should include the most striking example of its use in classical literature. This is found in Sulpicia's bitter gibe at her lover (Tibullus IV, 10, 1):

*Gratum est, securus multum quod iam tibi de me
permittis, subito ne male inepta cadam.*

I have discussed the use of the word here at considerable length in my own note on the passage (Tibullus, p. 513).

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.